Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan *(Vadakkancheri)* : Is it not a self-evident proposition, Sir?

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Constitutional Adviser)*: Yes, Sir; but to support my proposition I am trying to quote authorities.. ..

Mr. President: All the same, I would like to hear that authority.

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Constitutional Adviser)*: On page 344 May's Parliamentary Practice, it is stated "the interpretation of the standing order has been further clarified by a series of rulings, and the effect of these rulings may be set out as follows: To be in order, the matter raised by a motion for the adjournment under S. O. No. 8 must be (1) definite, (2) urgent, (3) of public importance; (4) involve the administrative responsibility of the government and (5) conform with the rules applicable to all motions for the adjournment whether under the S. O. No. 8 or not". The point is again referred to at page 346 in a bit more detail where under paragraph 4 it is stated that—"Matter must involve the administrative responsibility of the Government.—and that Motions have been disallowed because the matter raised was one—

(*a*) for which another authority was immediately responsible *e.g.* (*i*) A Dominion Government or a Colonial Government having responsibility in the matter raised (*ii*) A local authority (*iii*) A provincial police authority (*iv*) A statutory authority (*v*) A judiciial authority (*vi*) A foreign Government;

(*b*) for which no administrative authority was responsible, etc.

Therefore the point is that the opinion of the Constitutional Advisory Committee is not a fit matter for an adjournment motion.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan *(Vadakkancheri)*: Is it not the other way?

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Constitutional Adviser)* If the recommendation of the Constitutional Advisory Committee upon any matter happened to be accepted by Government and orders passed, then that order if of urgent public importance and a recent one may rightly form the subject of a motion of this kind,

Mr. S. P. Luiz *(Nominated)*: Will it not be late then?

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Constitutional Adviser)*; There is no question of being late involved in this issue. Therefore I beg to submit that this motion is not in order.

Mr. President: I reserve my decision for tomorrow along with the other adjournment motions, because I think of examining the question in detail.

5. ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE PANEL CHAIRMEN

I nominate Mr. M. K. Raja and K. K. Kannan as Panel Chairmen for this session.

6. ANNOUNCEMENT OF BILLS ASSENTED TO BY HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA

Secretary to the Council: The following bills which have been passed by this House have received the gracious assent of His Highness the Maharaja.

1. The Cochin Stamp Act (Amendment) Bill.
2. The Cochin Sales Tax Act (Amendment) Bill.
3. The Cochin Income-tax Act (Amendment) Bill.
4. The Cochin Vehicles Taxation Act (Amendment) Bill.
5. The Cochin Court Fees Act (Amendment) Bill.
6. The Chittur Cess Recovery Bill.
7. The Cochin Prohibition Bill.

7. DEMANDS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS

(i) Under 23—Education—11. Miscellaneous

Mr. P. Govinda Menon *(Prime Minister)*: I move for a supplementary grant of Rs. 1,000 under 23-Education 11, Miscellaneous. Sir, This Government had occasion to contact the Government of the United Provinces and make a request that a few seats may be reserved for Cochin students in the Medical Colleges in the United Provinces. That Government pleased to grant finally one seat every year to a student from Cochin in the Agra Medical College and Government have accordingly selected a student and sent to the Agra Medical College. The student has already joined. But the final reply from the Government of United Provinces was received only after the preparation of the budget. A capitation fee of Rs. 1,000 per year has to be paid. This supplementary grant is intended for that purpose. I pray that the House be pleased to grant the same.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly